

SECRET
NFAC #

2817-78
OLC #78-2667

SALT - 19/78
6 July 1978


Salt

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Congressional Support Staff
FROM: Chief, SALT Support Staff
SUBJECT: Review of Papers Prepared by the Foreign Affairs
and National Defense Division of the Library of
Congress

Attached, per request of [] is a memo for the record
on our recent review of papers on SALT-related subjects prepared by
Library of Congress analysts.


25X1

Attachment:
As stated



25X1

SECRET



25X1

SECRET

-2-

SALT - 19/78

SUBJECT: Review of Papers Prepared by the Foreign Affairs and National
Defense Division of the Library of Congress

Distribution:

Orig & 1 - Addressee
1 - OLC
1 - SALT Support Staff
1 - NFAC Registry

SALT (6Jul78)

25X1

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

6 July 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Review of Papers Prepared by the Foreign Affairs and
National Defense Division of the Library of Congress

1. Early in May, 1978, at the request of Roger Molander of the NSC Staff (coordinator for furnishing SALT materials to Congress), we reviewed in a sources and methods context an "unclassified" draft paper on SALT Verification prepared by Mark Lowenthal, an analyst in national defense in the Library of Congress. This paper was also reviewed by other members of the SALT Working Group at Molander's request. On May 26, we went over the paper with Lowenthal, recommending deletion of materials that were incorrect or, in our view, classified. Lowenthal indicated that he would take all of our comments into account in his final draft, and promised us a copy. We have not received it yet.

2. On June 6, Lowenthal called me and asked if we could review a paper written by Bruce Blair, of the Library of Congress Staff, on the subject of arms control implications of strategic monitoring programs. I told him we would look at the paper, but could make no promises that we could participate in an unclassified paper on this subject. Review of the paper revealed that it contained a mixture of accurate, classified information (although attributed to unclassified sources), and inaccurate and misleading information. We met with the author and the project coordinator, Jonathan Medalia, on June 26. I informed them of our findings in general terms and told them that we could not participate in the preparation of an authoritative unclassified paper on this sensitive subject. They said that they had a request for such a study from an unnamed Congressional individual or group, and felt they had to proceed. I suggested that it would be more appropriate for that member or members of Congress to be provided a classified briefing on the subject, since it simply could not be done adequately on an unclassified basis. I returned the paper to the author without any specific comments. Mr. Medalia indicated that he would repeat my comments to his supervisor, who might contact me. He has not done so to date.

25X1

~~SECRET~~